

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4).

Dated: July 9 2007
Electronic Signature for Sharon M. Sintich: /Sharon M. Sintich # 48,484/
.

Docket No.: 29915/6280N3
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:
Mark E. Gurney et al.

Confirmation No. 3518

Application No.: 10/652,927

Art Unit: 1649

Filed: August 29, 2003

Examiner: G. Emch

For: ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE SECRETASE, APP
SUBSTRATES THEREFOR, AND USES
THEREFOR

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This is a response to the Office Communication dated June 27, 2007, which indicated that the response filed April 2, 2007 was not fully responsive. In particular, the Examiner asserted that the Applicants did not fully reply to the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection in the Office Action mailed September 28, 2006.

On page of 15 of the previous response, the Applicants addressed the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, and 16-19 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,913,918, 6,825,023, 6,828,117 and U.S. Patent Application No. 10/940,867. However, the Applicants inadvertently overlooked the rejection in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/652,830. Applicants request that this double patenting rejection in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/652,830 be held in abeyance until there is an indication of allowable subject matter. At that time, Applicants will consider filing appropriate disclaimer(s). It is premature to disclaim term before the scope of an allowable claim is clear.